



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

magistrates of the place to silence him. But the Gentiles, not being under the same prejudices, were willing to give him a fair hearing, and so it was among the Gentiles that the greater part of his converts were made, and Apostle of the Gentiles was the honourable title to which he gained a right.

Even those Jews who became converts to Christianity were the cause of St. Paul's principal troubles. The great majority of them were zealous for the law of Moses, and they demanded that all the ceremonial ordinances of the Mosaic law should be made obligatory on all Christians, whether Jew or Gentile. Now, though St. Paul was quite willing that the Jews should retain their national customs, and though he himself always set an example of complying with them, yet when these things were put forward as necessary to salvation he made resistance at once. He knew of but one way of salvation, the same for Jew and Gentile—namely, the blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And when the attempt was made to enforce on the Gentiles the observance of the Jewish ordinances, he resisted vigorously a measure calculated to give false notions as to the way of salvation, and told them that if they thus attempted to find salvation by the works of the law, Christ should profit them nothing. By the decided line he took in this controversy, St. Paul became nearly as unpopular among the large number of Christian Jews as he had been among the unbelieving Jews; more particularly as there were others of the Apostles who did not at first speak so decidedly. In their opinions, indeed, they were all agreed, but there were some who shrank from the unpopularity of maintaining them boldly in the face of Jewish prejudice. We read that St. Peter, who had been in the habit, at Antioch, a gentile town, of mixing familiarly and eating with the gentile Christians, withdrew himself from their society as soon as Jerusalem Jews had come to the town. And Barnabas also was carried away by the same dissimulation. Now, Paul was under obligations to Barnabas. It was Barnabas who had introduced him to the Church at Jerusalem, when every one at first shrank from the society of him whom they had only known as a persecutor, and of the sincerity of whose conversion they had no assurance. And it was Barnabas who had introduced him and brought him to labour in this very Church of Antioch. But St. Paul saw of what dangerous consequence it would be to allow the impression to be produced that the Gentiles admitted to the Church were not thereby rendered sufficiently pure for the Jewish Christians to associate with. He spoke out at once. Nor does he ever seem to have heard the notion that Peter had been appointed by Christ head of the Church, or that he was in any way bound to submit to his authority. On the contrary, he speaks of himself as not in any respect behind the chiefest apostles, and he acted on his conviction now. He withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed, and rebuked him publicly before them all.

We cannot attempt in this short sketch to give any detailed account of the labours and travels of St. Paul in the cause of Christ. He went about from city to city, trying always to choose new ground as the scene of his labours, and not to enter upon fields of work that had been already pre-occupied by others. We might, if space permitted, describe how careful he was, by every innocent compliance, to make the gospel which he preached attractive. He became all things to all men. With the Jews he was the foremost to comply with all the burdensome obligations of their law, knowing that such compliance was innocent, although not obligatory. With the Gentiles he was eager to insist that no similar compliance could be demanded from them. With such of his converts as ardently loved him, and desired to show their love by contributing to his support; he did not allow any feelings of pride or love of independence to prevent him from accepting this proof of their love. But in any place where there was the least danger that his motives might be misconstrued, and that his preaching might be regarded as a means for gaining money, he refused to accept the least pecuniary assistance, and preferred to gain his bread by working with his own hands, rather than be chargeable to any of them. When collections were made by the Gentile Churches for the relief of the poor Jewish Christians, Paul, anxious to avoid the slightest possible imputation, refused to take the sole charge of the money, and insisted that they should send one or two of themselves with him to Jerusalem in charge of these collections. And, in fine, it was to an instance of this readiness of his to be all things to all men that his long imprisonment was owing.

When he went up to Jerusalem with the funds which had been thus collected in distant countries, he found among the Christian Jews great prejudices against him, as we have already observed. They were told that he had everywhere insisted on the Jews forsaking their own national customs, and ceasing to observe the Mosaic law. Now, this was what St. Paul never had done. He always treated these matters as things indifferent. The Gentiles were not bound to embrace these customs, nor the Jews to leave them off. And, in order to illustrate his views by his own practice, by the advice of St. James, who all through these transactions appears to be the foremost man in the Jerusalem Church, he made his appearance in the Temple, publicly complying with one of the Jewish ceremonial rites. But it happened that while in the Temple he was seen not only by the believing Jews,

whom he came there to gratify, but by unbelieving Jews, who had known him abroad, and who were prejudiced against him as a heretic, and a villifier of their religion. They raised a cry against him that he was profaning the Temple, and proceeded to take the law into their own hands, by beating him, and would certainly have killed him had not a Roman captain who was at hand come up with his soldiers and rescued him from their hands. Thus St. Paul became a prisoner in the hand of the Romans, while the Jews proceeded against him and endeavoured to obtain his death in due course of law. No crime could be proved against him, but yet he could obtain no release from Roman governors, who cared little for detaining an innocent man in prison, if they found that by so doing they could gain the favour of the people over whom they ruled. And so, at last, Paul, finding that he could obtain no justice in that country, and that his life was in danger of being sacrificed by an organised conspiracy, was forced to use his privilege as a Roman citizen, and appeal to be sent to Rome for the hearing of the Emperor himself. Thus was brought about, by God's providence, Paul's journey to Rome, which he had for some time been anxious to accomplish. It is plain, both from the Acts and from the Epistle to the Romans, that up to this time no Apostle had as yet visited Rome, although, of course, many Christians had found their way to this centre of the civilized world.

St. Paul had greatly desired to go thither, and by his apostolic power to impart to them some spiritual gift, but various causes prevented, until, at last, God himself accomplished his design in a way which Paul could not have foreseen, and sent him there as a prisoner, to complete the foundation of the Roman Church. Although a prisoner, he was allowed to dwell in his own hired house, and to preach the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, no man forbidding him. And so he came to know that the things which had happened to him, disastrous as they might have seemed to him, had been made by God all to turn to the furtherance of the Gospel, which he had been thus enabled to make known in the Emperor's palace, and in other places whither it would not otherwise have reached. St. Luke closes his narrative, leaving the Apostle thus actively labouring at Rome; and, though some of his own letters, written from Rome, throw a little further light on his labours there, to the last they show no trace of his having been joined there by any other Apostle. On the contrary, he complains of the solitude in which he was left there by all his Christian friends at the time of his trial.

We do not wish to continue our narrative further than we have Scripture guidance; but we may conclude by briefly stating the opinion received on the authority of early uninspired writers, that St. Paul, when, after long delays, he had at length obtained a hearing from the Emperor, was set at liberty, and then extended his preaching to western nations of Europe, which he saw was being reached; that he afterwards returned to Rome, and there suffered martyrdom for his Saviour, being beheaded by order of the Emperor Nero.

ORIGEN AGAINST CELSUS.

Nothing is more dangerous than to quote from a book without having looked into it. Our readers had recently an excellent illustration of the truth of this maxim in the appeal which Mr. Power was so unfortunate as to make to the work of Origen against Celsus, in favour of invocation to saints. We showed at the time that the very passage which Mr. Power had cited in favour of this practice was only made to bear this appearance by being scandalously mutilated, while, in reality, it contained a strong condemnation of the practice. We acquit Mr. Power himself of the guilt of this mutilation, for which the person who furnished him with the quotation must be responsible; but as he appealed to Origen, we have a mind to let him hear what Origen really says. Nothing gives a more unfair idea of the meaning of the Fathers than to see a sentence here and a paragraph there extracted in books of controversy, without any reference to the context. Any one who takes the trouble to read over connectedly one of their tracts gets a clear conception of their opinions and habits of thought, such as he would derive from no amount of isolated extracts. If our space permitted it, we should have liked nothing better than to give an analysis of Origen's whole eighth book against Celsus, to which Mr. Power has appealed. Our readers would then be able to judge whether it is favourable to the Church of Rome or not. But on trying the experiment we found that anything like a regular analysis of the book would occupy too much room, and would include much that would not interest our readers. And we must be satisfied with giving in the present article all of his eighth book (whether it makes for or against us) that has any reference to the subjects in dispute between the Churches of England and Rome. This work of Origen against Celsus was written in the middle of the third century. It was a defence of Christianity against the attacks of Celsus, a heathen philosopher; and was the most highly esteemed of all the early apologies for our religion. The Benedictine editors quote the opinion of the learned Dupin that, "of all the apologies for the Christian religion which were published in the first ages of the Church, none seems comparable to this most complete one of Origen." And they also cite with approbation the statement of Bishop Bull that, no other writings of

Origen can be considered as so clearly expressing Catholic doctrine. Some of Origen's writings were composed for private circulation among friends, in which he writes freely, and does not so much express his own fixed and definite opinion as repeat the reasonings of others, or even ventilate doubts and scruples of his own. But in his public writings, which he composed against unbelievers, or against heretics, he proceeds in the beaten track, and studiously maintains the doctrine received in the Catholic Church. Some, too, of his writings were composed in the heat of youth, others record the opinions of his mature age. Now, the work against Celsus is, by the consent of all, of this latter class. In it he maintains the common doctrine of Christianity against the most able opponents of our religion; this work has been polished by the author's greatest care and learning, and was written by him when more than sixty years of age.

Before we come to the eighth book, to which Mr. Power has appealed, we cannot forbear quoting the commencement of the fifth book, on account of its intimate connection with the subject of invocation of angels. Invocation of *Saints*, we must say, appears to us to have been scarcely heard of in Origen's time. No one then seems to have thought of addressing a prayer to the departed spirits of men and women like themselves. But Scripture informs us that the angels are spirits whose ministration is employed in earthly affairs. It was natural, then, that men should turn to address requests directly to these ministering spirits. Yet, the early Church constantly opposed this superstitious practice, and we shall find Origen arguing strenuously against it.

The following is the passage in Celsus's writings which elicited Origen's opinion on the subject. The word *angels*, it must be explained, was not familiar to Celsus, who was a heathen. He had heard of gods and of demons, but angels had no place in the heathen system of mythology. He accordingly writes as follows:—"Neither God, nor Son of God, has descended or can descend. But, if you say that certain angels have descended, tell who are these. Are they gods, or some other kind of being? Some other kind, I suppose, namely, demons."

To this Origen replies as follows:—

"We confess that the angels are ministering spirits, sent to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation; that they ascend bearing the prayers of men to the purest heavenly regions, even to the purer regions above the heavens; and that they descend thence, bearing to each man according to his deserts, as God has commanded them to minister. And as we have learned to call them *angels* (a name derived from this their mission); so, on account of their divine character, we even find them called *gods* in Scripture, but not so as that it is commanded us to reverence and worship instead of God those who merely minister and bear to us blessings from God."

If our friend Mr. Power has read so far, he will probably exclaim, Is this all that the CATHOLIC LAYMAN has to say about Origen? Origen says, "that the angels bear our prayers to heaven; that they are divine in their nature, and are even called *gods* in Scripture;" and all he says on the other side is, "that we are not to give them the honour due to God only; we never offer them the honour due to God only, we only invoke their assistance, and ask their intercession, but we do not give them the honours due to God only."

Well, wait a while, Mr. Power, and we shall show you that Origen considered all worship, adoration, offering prayers, asking assistance, as part of the honour which can be lawfully offered to God only. He goes on as follows:—"For all prayers, supplications, intercession, and giving of thanks, must be offered to God over all; through Him, who is above all angels, our high priest, the living Word of God. To this Word we shall offer our prayers and supplications, or intercessions and thanksgivings, if we distinguish the true language from the incorrect language concerning prayer."

"But it is not reasonable to call upon the angels, since we do not possess any knowledge concerning angels—a knowledge which it is above man's power to obtain. Nay, let us imagine that we did possess this wonderful and mysterious knowledge concerning angels. We should then know their nature, and the functions which each is appointed to discharge; but this would not permit us to have the confidence to offer our prayers to any save to that God who is sufficient for all things through our Saviour Jesus, the Son of God, who is the Word, the Wisdom, the Truth, and whatever else the Scriptures of the Apostles and Prophets have declared concerning Him. And in order to obtain that the angels should be propitious to us, and should do everything for us, it is sufficient if we, as far as human powers permit, imitate their frame of mind even as they imitate God."

Such is the opinion of Origen as to the lawfulness of addressing prayers to those angels whom he believes to be incessantly employed in ministering to God's people. But we do not find that he believed that departed *Saints* have any such employment, and he never thinks of discussing the propriety of praying to them, such a practice not having been heard of in his day. But, of course, the same arguments apply in both cases.

We now turn to his eighth book, as being that appealed to by Mr. Power, although there is much more in the

preceding books of which we would gladly have given an account.

In the opening of this book, Celsus is arguing in favour of the worship of *dæmons*, a name which, though in Christian use always employed in a bad sense, was not so understood by the heathen. They used the word to indicate those inferior spirits whom, as they supposed, the Supreme God employed in the ministration of human affairs. Christians, however, always used the word in a bad sense; and they supposed that the gods whom the heathens worshipped, Jupiter, Juno, &c., were in reality *dæmons*—in testimony of which Origen appeals to the words of the Psalm, which he translates, "As for the gods of the heathen, they are but *dæmons*." (Ps. 96. 5.)

Celsus, then, is in the commencement replying to the Christian answer to his arguments for the worship of *dæmons*, namely, that it was not lawful for them to serve two masters. He says this language is employed by persons who invest their god with human affections. A man is annoyed if his servant undertake to serve another also, because he suffers injury by being worse served himself. And so, indeed, it is not right to attempt to worship several *dæmons*, or several heroes, because one cannot equally well serve them all. But as God is capable of suffering no pain or injury, we need not, through fear of him, refrain from worshipping others. Nay rather, when we worship several gods, we do honour to Him who is above all, since we honour what belongs to him. Now, we cannot honour any to whom this has not been given by Him. The worship given to those who pertain to God does not displease or grieve God, to whom all belong.

The reader will see that Celsus was not an idolater, if by idolatry we are to understand, as Roman Catholic writers do, the giving that honour to a creature which we believe to be due to the supreme God. Celsus and his heathen friends did not imagine the creatures whom they worshipped to be the supreme God. They were careful to offer them only such honour as they believed to be not displeasing to the Supreme; nay rather, to be pleasing in his sight, since addressed to those who were ministers employed by Him, and to whom this honour had been conceded by Him.

Origen commences his reply to this by an examination of the sense in which the words God and Lord are used in Scripture. We read in the Bible of Gods and Lords in the plural number; for instance, "He is God above all Gods." Ps. 96. 9. "God standeth in the congregation of the Gods." Ps. 81. 1. "Give thanks unto the God of Gods." Ps. 135. 2. And St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 8. 5, "Although there be who are called Gods in heaven and on earth, as there are Gods many and Lords many, yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things." By these Gods and Lords, Origen understands not the heathen Gods, whom he holds to be only *dæmons*, but the angels. "But then," he says, "although there be many who are in name and many who are in reality, Gods and Lords, we must not adore any but those who are adored as Gods by the heathen, but even those Gods that Scripture mentions. He raises himself above all demon worship who refuses to do anything acceptable to *dæmons*; and he raises himself above the portion of those called Gods by St. Paul, who cannot be persuaded to worship anyone else in conjunction with God, or to attempt to serve two masters."

As for the objection that God is not a man, and, therefore, cannot be injured by our giving our service to another, Origen well replies, "He, God, is not injured, but we are injured, if we separate himself from the portion of Him who is over all. We do not worship God as if He needed our worship, or as if He suffered grief or injury when we withhold our worship, but that we ourselves might receive the benefit of our worship, and might be free from grief and suffering, in serving the Supreme God, through his only begotten Son."

Then, Celsus says, that he only contends that those may be worshipped to whom this has been granted by God. Origen replies: "How will you prove that this honour has been given them by God, and not rather by men who erred through ignorance, in falling away from Him to whom their worship was properly and exclusively due?"

Celsus next objects: "How can you blame us for worshipping others beside the Supreme God, since you yourselves worship a man who appeared but lately, and you think that you do God no injury in worshipping his minister?" Origen answers by denying that Christians worshipped a man, and quotes the texts, "I and my Father are one;" "Before Abraham was, I am;" in proof that our Lord's existence did not date from the time of his appearance in the world, and that the object of Christian worship was none other than the Supreme God.

Celsus went on to infer, "If you worship the Son of God, you must allow that not only God, but also his ministers, may be worshipped."

Origen answers, "If by the ministers of God you meant Gabriel, Michael, and the other angels and archangels, I should, perhaps, with some modifications as to the meaning of this word, 'worship' (*Θεραπεύω*), and as to the acts of worship, state my views on this subject. But since those whom you call ministers of God, we believe to be *dæmons*, ministers of evil, and servants of the prince of this world, we refuse to venerate or worship them. And we venerate God alone, and his only Son, his word and image, with

our supplications according to our power, offering our prayers to the God of all, through his only begotten Son."

This is one of the passages which Mr. Power cites, and which Roman Catholics think favourable to them, because Origen says, that, perhaps, in a certain sense he might apply the word *Θεραπεύω* to angels. But the whole context makes it plain that while Origen would regard angels as entitled to all the respect and honour which Protestants are willing to give to those ministers of God, he considered the offering of prayers as that part of worship which could lawfully be paid to God alone, through Christ.

The passage next following, in which Celsus finds fault with the Christians because they had no temples, no altars, no images, would lead to so long a discussion that we must postpone it, interesting as it is, to another opportunity, and are satisfied to stop here, as the last passage which we have quoted is the only one we can find which contains anything like a concession in favour of the Roman Catholic views.

CHARGE OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

THE recent charge of his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin to his clergy, at the late Triennial visitation, contains so much valuable matter, practical, as well as controversial, that we cannot do better than call the attention of our readers to the following extracts from it, without venturing to make any observations of our own upon the subject. We sincerely wish we could contribute in any way to the furtherance of the great object which his Grace seems to have had in view, in selecting the subject of it, viz., the more general and frequent attendance at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper by all who profess to be worshippers of Jesus.

The following are the extracts referred to:—

"I cannot doubt that among the causes which have led to the neglect of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper by many, and in one Christian sect to the absolute rejection of it, must be reckoned the superstitions that have prevailed on the subject. For, every kind of superstition, besides the intrinsic evil of it, has a tendency to cast discredit on any doctrine or institution that has been abused by an admixture of human devices. The 'wall daubed with untempered mortar,' which has been built up by presumptuous man, has a tendency to bring down in its fall the original and sound parts of the building. And thus the superstitious adoration of the elements of bread and wine—not to mention that it has exposed to contemptuous rejection the religion itself of which it was represented as a part—led, by a natural re-action, to the entire exclusion of the sacrament itself, which had been thus abused, from the list of Christian ordinances. The manifest futility of the theory of transubstantiation, and the superstition thence resulting, caused a well-known sect to reject the truth along with the falsehood. And among ourselves there have arisen of late years (and this is one of my reasons for now calling your attention to the subject) persons teaching strange mystical notions respecting this sacrament, such as it is hardly possible to distinguish from the doctrine of transubstantiation, and which have probably contributed to lead many of themselves and of their admirers to take the consistent step of openly going over to the Church of Rome. For when such a theory is maintained as has been, by some professed members of our Church, in manifest contradiction to the express word of our Article—an Article which they explain away in a 'non-natural sense' in such a way that anything may be made of anything—when it is maintained that 'the wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, when they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the sacramental bread, are partakers of the body of Christ (though to their own condemnation), a strong presumption is created in favour of a Church which, consistently with this doctrine, teaches the adoration of the Host.'

"Some Protestants we meet with who congratulate themselves on their exemption from Romish error on this and on other points, but who need to be reminded that they are guilty of a worse fault themselves than what they censure in their brethren! from many of whom they might take an example to their own profit. For we find but too many Protestants (as I observed just now) withdrawing from the Lord's table, in disregard of his plain injunction; while Roman Catholics do perform what they conceive to be a duty, though under what we hold to be erroneous notions concerning it. And yet there is much more reason for them to shrink from it under that kind of mysterious dread which so often keeps back Protestants. For what we have to trust to is, the divine commands and promises, together with that faith and devotion of our own of which we can judge from our own consciousness. But the Romanist has to rely, in addition, on the inward intention of the priest. If he be a secret infidel, not intending, nor believing it possible, to convert the bread into the Lord's body, and inwardly regarding the whole service with disdainful mockery (and this is what hundreds of priests declared of themselves at the time of the French Revolution), the whole sacrament is nullified; so that no Romanist can have a reasonable certainty that he is not adoring a morsel of common bread. Yet many of them perform, nevertheless, what they sincerely believe to be their duty, while many a Protestant omits what he acknowledges to be his.

"As for those semi-Romish theories (as they may be called) which I have adverted to, I shall not attempt any particular examination of them, as they are so mystically obscure that it may be well doubted whether even the framers of them attach themselves, any distinct meaning to their own language; and it cannot be doubted that to plain ordinary Christians they must be altogether unintelligible. But I would remark, in reference to the doctrine of transubstantiation itself, and to any others closely approaching it, that it is not advisable to resort (as some eminent divines had done) to metaphysical arguments relating to the properties of matter, or to appeals to the bodily senses, or to allegations of the abstract impossibility of such a miracle as is in this case pretended. At least, any considerations of this kind should hold a secondary and very subordinate place; and the primary and principal appeal should be made to the plain declarations of Scripture in their most natural sense. If we are fully convinced that the Scriptures contain a divine revelation, we are required to receive whatever they distinctly assure us of, however little we may be able to understand its possibility. But, then, if it be something extremely paradoxical, we may fairly expect to have—if it is to be an article of faith—a more distinct and unmistakable declaration of it in Scripture than if it had been something antecedently probable, and in harmony with the rest of what is revealed.

"Now, to the present case this principle will apply. It is, indeed, not correct to say (though it is very commonly said) that the alleged miracle of transubstantiation contradicts the senses. For, all that is testified by the senses is, the attributes (the accidents) of any material object—the appearance, for instance, and smell, and taste of bread; and all these attributes the advocates of transubstantiation admit to remain unchanged. Our belief that that which has these attributes is the substance of bread is an inference which we draw from the testimony of our senses; but however correct the inference may be, it is not the very thing which the senses themselves testify, but a conclusion deduced from the perception of those qualities which the senses do present to us. To state the matter in the briefest form; the procedure of Protestants, and—in all other cases—of Roman Catholics also, is this: Whatever has all the accidents of bread is the substance, bread: this that is before us has those accidents; therefore it is the substance, bread. Now, of the two premises from which this inference is drawn, it is the minor only that the senses attest, and it is the other premise that the Romanist denies. But he draws a like inference with ours, from the testimony of his senses, in all other cases though he maintains, in this one case, not that our senses deceive us, but that there is a change of the substance of bread into that of a human body, while all the accidents (as they are called), of which—and of which alone—the senses take cognizance, remain unchanged. And if asked how this can be, and how a body can be at once, and entire, in thousands of places at once, he replies by a reference to the Divine Omnipotence. But it is admitted that all this is extremely paradoxical, and that the alleged miracle is a complete contrast to the acknowledged miracles of Jesus and his Apostles, which were appeals to the senses—*Signs* (as they were usually called) of a Divine mission; *proofs* as a foundation for faith; not matter of faith to be received in consequence of our being already believers in the religion taught. The miracles that are recorded in Scripture cannot ever be reckoned improbable; for, great as is, no doubt, the abstract probability of any miracle, considered simply in itself, it is plain that (as is well observed by Origen) the propagation of Christianity by the sole force of miraculous claims, supposing them unfounded—the overthrow of the religions of the whole civilised world by a handful of Jewish peasants and fishermen, destitute of all superhuman powers—would be far more improbable than all the miracles narrated in Scripture. Even if we had, therefore, less full and distinct statements in Scripture of the miracles of Jesus and his Apostles than we have, there would have been a strong presumption that these men could not have done what they did but by the display of miraculous signs.

"But as for the alleged miracle of transubstantiation, it is but reasonable that we should at least require a very strong and clear declaration of it in the Inspired Writings. And here it may be worth while to remark by the way, that it is not only paradoxical, but at variance even with the very description given of it by those who maintain it. For if you ask any one of them to state what was, e.g. the first miraculous sign displayed by Moses, he will say it was the change of the rod into a serpent; that which had the form, colour, motion, and, in short, all the 'accidents' of a serpent being in reality Moses' rod; and he will say, not that the serpent was changed into a rod, but, on the contrary, that the rod was changed into a serpent. In like manner, therefore, if that which has the appearance and all the 'accidents' of bread be, in reality, a human body, he should say, not that bread is converted into the body, but that the body has become bread. And if he says that that which was originally bread is changed into the Lord's body, he must yet say also that that body is immediately after re-converted into bread.

"All this surely requires, as I have said, very clear and strong Scripture authority to establish it. But when we ask for this, we are referred to such a passage as 'This